

Primary Decompositions for Left Noetherian Rings

V. V. Bavula

Abstract

Two constructions are given that describe respectively all shortest primary decompositions and all shortest uniform decompositions for left Noetherian rings. They show that these decompositions are, in general, highly non-unique.

Key words: primary decomposition, uniform decomposition, the left spectrum, left primes, uniform module.

Mathematics subject classification 2000: 16P40, 16P70.

Contents

1. Introduction.
2. Primary decompositions for commutative Noetherian rings.
3. The left spectrum of a ring and associated left primes.
4. Primary decompositions.
5. Description of shortest primary decompositions.
6. Description of shortest uniform decompositions.

1 Introduction

In this paper, module means a left module and all rings have 1.

Lasker-Noether's theory of the primary decomposition of a submodule of a finitely generated module over a commutative Noetherian ring was generalized for modules over a not necessarily commutative left Noetherian ring by L. Lesieur and R. Croisot [3] and later by O. Goldman [2]. The relations between Goldman's *primary* decomposition theory and the *tertiary* decomposition theory of Lesieur and Croisot were clarified by G. Michler [5]. The former is a 'finer' decomposition theory than the later, it deals with modules rather than with two-sided ideals. G. Michler showed that each finitely generated Goldman-primary R -module is tertiary but not vice versa, in general, and that each finitely generated tertiary R -module is Goldman-primary iff non-isomorphic indecomposable injective R -modules have different associated ideals.

In Section 2, we recall briefly main results on primary decompositions in commutative situation. In Section 3, we collect some results on the left spectrum of a ring and left primes. In Section 4, it is proved that each submodule of uniformly finite module admits

a primary decomposition (Theorem 4.4). Note that every finitely generated module over a left Noetherian ring is uniformly finite.

In Section 5, Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4 describe respectively all the shortest primary decompositions and all the maximal shortest primary decompositions of submodules of uniformly finite modules. They explain why primary decompositions are not unique (in general, they are highly non-unique).

In Section 6, (maximal shortest) uniform decompositions are introduced. Theorem 6.4 and Corollary 6.6 describe respectively all the shortest uniform decompositions and all the maximal shortest uniform decompositions of submodules of uniformly finite modules. It is proved that shortest uniform decomposition is irredundant primary decomposition (Corollary 6.2), and that each primary decomposition can be refined to a uniform decomposition (Lemma 6.7).

2 Primary decompositions for commutative Noetherian rings

In this section, C is a **commutative Noetherian ring** and M is a finitely generated C -module.

A prime ideal P of C is called an **associated prime** to M if P is the annihilator of an element of M . The set of all primes associated to M is written $\text{Ass}_C(M)$. $\text{Ass}_C(M)$ is a finite nonempty set of primes each containing the annihilator $\text{ann}_C(M)$ of the module M . The set $\text{Ass}_C(M)$ includes all the primes minimal among primes containing $\text{ann}_C(M)$. The union of the associated primes of M consists of 0 and the set of zerodivisors of M . ([1], Theorem 3.1).

A submodule N of M is **primary** if $\text{Ass}_C(M/N)$ consists of just one prime, say P , then N is called **P -primary**. The intersection of P -primary submodules is P -primary. **Primary decomposition** consists of writing an arbitrary submodule N of M as a finite intersection of primary submodules.

The main properties of primary decomposition are given by the next theorem (see [1] for details).

Theorem 2.1 *Let C be a commutative Noetherian ring and let M be a finitely generated C -module.*

1. *Any submodule N of M with $N \neq M$ is a finite intersection of primary submodules, say $N = \cap_{i=1}^n N_i$ with N_i a P_i -primary submodule of M .*
2. *Every associated prime of M/N occurs among the P_i .*
3. *If the intersection is **irredundant** (i.e. no N_i can be dropped) then the P_i are precisely the associated primes of M/N .*
4. *If the intersection is **shortest** (i.e. there is no such intersection with fewer terms) then each associated prime of M/N is equal to P_i for exactly one index i .*

3 The left spectrum of ring and associated left primes

In this section, the left prime spectrum of a ring and an analogue of associates primes, so-called associated left primes (for modules over noncommutative rings) are considered.

Essential submodules. A submodule N of a module M is **essential** if $N \cap L \neq 0$ for all nonzero submodules L of M , and we write $N \subseteq_e M$. The following (obvious) properties of essential submodules are freely used in proofs ([4], 2.2.2):

1. If $N \subseteq_e M$ and $M \subseteq_e L$ then $N \subseteq_e L$.
2. If $N \subseteq_e M$ and $L \subseteq_e M$ then $N \cap L \subseteq_e M$.
3. If $N_i \subseteq_e M_i$, $i \in I$, then $\bigoplus_{i \in I} N_i \subseteq_e \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$.
4. If N is a submodule of M then there exists a submodule N' of M such that $N \cap N' = 0$ and $N \oplus N' \subseteq_e M$.

Uniform modules and the uniform dimension. A module U is **uniform** if $U \neq 0$ and each nonzero submodule of U is an essential submodule. So, a nonzero module is uniform iff it does not contain a direct sum of nonzero submodules. A module M is said to have **finite uniform dimension** ($\text{u.dim}(M) < \infty$) if it contains no infinite direct sum of nonzero submodules. *If $M \neq 0$ has finite uniform dimension then*

- (i) *M contains an essential submodule which is a finite direct sum, say $U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_n$, of uniform submodules U_i ([4], 2.2.8).*
- (ii) *any direct sum of nonzero submodules of M has at most n summands, and*
- (iii) *a direct sum of uniform submodules of M is essential in M iff it has precisely n summands ([4], 2.2.9).*

The nonnegative integer n is called the **uniform dimension** (or **Goldie dimension**) of M and is written $\text{u.dim}(M)$.

The essential equivalence $\sim_e$. We say that modules M_1 and M_2 are **essentially equivalent** and write $M_1 \sim_e M_2$ if there exist essential submodules $L_1 \subseteq_e M_1$ and $L_2 \subseteq_e M_2$ with $L_1 \simeq L_2$. It is obvious that this is an equivalence relation. We denote by $[M]$ the equivalence class of the module M under $\sim_e$.

Definition. The set of equivalence classes of all the uniform left R -modules is called the **left spectrum** $\text{l.spec}(R)$ of the ring R . Elements of the left spectrum are called **left primes**. Similarly, the **right spectrum** $\text{r.spec}(R)$ is defined.

Let $\widehat{R}$ be the set of isomorphism classes of simple left R -modules. Clearly, two simple R -modules are isomorphic iff they are essentially equivalent, hence $\widehat{R} \subseteq \text{l.spec}(R)$.

Lemma 3.1 *If C is a commutative Noetherian ring then $\text{l.spec}(R) = \text{r.spec}(R) = \{[C/P] \mid P \in \text{Spec}(C)\}$, and the map $\text{l.spec}(R) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$, $[C/P] \mapsto P$, is a bijection with the inverse $P \mapsto [C/P]$.*

Proof. This is evident. $\square$

So, the left spectrum is a natural generalization of the spectrum in the commutative situation.

For a left Noetherian ring R , let $\mathcal{I}(R)$ be the set of isomorphism classes of *indecomposable injective* R -modules. The map

$$\text{l.spec}(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(R), \quad [U] \mapsto [E(U)],$$

is a bijection with the inverse $[E] \mapsto [E]$ where $E(U)$ is the injective hull of the R -module U .

Example. Let $A_1 = \langle x, \partial \mid \partial x - x\partial = 1 \rangle$ be the (first) Weyl algebra over a field K of characteristic zero. Note that the Weyl algebra A_1 is a simple Noetherian domain which contains no simple submodules, and any proper factor module of the left A_1 -module A_1 has finite length. So, if U is a uniform A_1 -module then either U contains a simple submodule, say M (in this case, $[U] = [M]$) or otherwise U contains a copy of ${}_A A_1$ (in this case, $[U] = [A_1]$). It follows that

$$\text{l.spec}(A_1) = \widehat{A_1} \cup \{[A_1]\}.$$

Theorem 3.2 *Let $M \neq 0$ be a module of finite uniform dimension n , $\oplus_{i=1}^n U_i$ and $\oplus_{i=1}^n V_i$ be direct sums of uniform submodules of M . Then, up to order of the U_i , $[U_1] = [V_1], \dots, [U_n] = [V_n]$.*

Proof. Note that any direct sum of n uniform submodules of M is an essential submodule of M . In particular, the submodules $U := \oplus_{i=1}^n U_i$ and $V := \oplus_{i=1}^n V_i$ are essential in M . We prove the following (more strong) statement: *up to order of the U_i , there exist nonzero submodules $V'_1 \subseteq V_1, \dots, V'_n \subseteq V_n$ such that $[V'_1] = [U_1], \dots, [V'_n] = [U_n]$, and for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $V'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V'_i \oplus U_{i+1} \oplus \dots \oplus U_n \subseteq M$.* Clearly, the intersection $V'_1 := V_1 \cap U \neq 0$ since $V_1 \neq 0$ and U is an essential submodule of M . For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let K_i be the kernel of the canonical projection of V'_1 into U_i . Since V'_1 is a submodule of U , the intersection $K_1 \cap \dots \cap K_n$ must be zero, then one of the K_i must be zero (otherwise, $K_1 \cap \dots \cap K_n \neq 0$ as V'_1 is a uniform module, a contradiction). Up to order of the U_j , we may assume that $K_1 = 0$. Then the projection map $V'_1 \rightarrow U_1$ is a monomorphism, hence $[V'_1] = [U_1]$ and

$$V'_1 + U_2 + \dots + U_n = V'_1 \oplus U_2 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n.$$

This proves the claim for $i = 1$.

We use induction on i . Suppose that $i > 1$ and we have already found required $V'_1, \dots, V'_{i-1}$. We have to find a nonzero submodule V'_i of V_i such that $[V'_i] = [U_i]$ and $V'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V'_i \oplus U_{i+1} \oplus \dots \oplus U_n \subseteq M$ (up to order of the $U_i, U_{i+1}, \dots, U_n$). Repeating the same argument as above for the submodule $V'_i := V_i \cap (V'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V'_{i-1} \oplus U_i \oplus \dots \oplus U_n) \neq 0$ of $V'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V'_{i-1} \oplus U_i \oplus \dots \oplus U_n$ one can find $j \geq i$ such that the projection $V'_i \rightarrow U_j$ is a monomorphism (such j exists since V'_i can not be a submodule of $V'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V'_{i-1}$). Up to re-numeration of the $U_i, \dots, U_n$ one can assume that $j = i$, hence $[V'_i] = [U_i]$ and $V'_1 + \dots + V'_i + U_{i+1} + \dots + U_n = V'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V'_i \oplus U_{i+1} \oplus \dots \oplus U_n$, as required. This proves the claim and the theorem since $[V_1] = [V'_1], \dots, [V_n] = [V'_n]$. $\square$

Corollary 3.3 *Let M be a module of finite uniform dimension $n \geq 1$, $\oplus_{i=1}^n U_i$ be a direct sum of uniform submodules of M , L be a uniform submodule of M . Then $[L] = [U_i]$ for some i .*

Proof. Repeat the same argument as in the proof of the Theorem 3.2 in the case $i = 1$ but for the nonzero module $L' := L \cap \oplus_{i=1}^n U_i$. $\square$

Let M be a nonzero R -module of finite uniform dimension n , and let $\oplus_{i=1}^n U_i \subseteq_e M$ be a direct sum of uniform submodules of M . A left prime $X \in \text{l.spec}(R)$ is called **associated** to M if there exists a uniform submodule U of M such that $[U] = X$. Abusing language, we say that the uniform module U is **associated** to M .

The set of associated left primes of M ,

$$\text{As}_R(M) := \{[U] \in \text{l.spec}(R) \mid U \text{ is a uniform submodule of } M\}$$

contains *finitely many* elements since $\text{As}_R(M) = \{[U_i] \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ (Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.3). Let $[U_1], \dots, [U_s]$ be the (distinct) elements of the set $\text{As}_R(M)$. The **multiplicity** of $[U_i]$ in M is the number of summands in $\oplus_{i=1}^n U_i$ that are essentially equivalent to U_i , denoted $\text{mult}_M([U_i])$ or simply $\text{mult}(U_i)$. Clearly, $[M] = [U_1^{m_1} \oplus \dots \oplus U_s^{m_s}]$ with $m_i := \text{mult}_M([U_i])$.

Let C be a commutative Noetherian ring and M be a nonzero finitely generated C -module. By Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.3, the map

$$\text{Ass}_C(M) \rightarrow \text{As}_C(M), P \mapsto [C/P],$$

is a bijection with inverse $[U] \mapsto \text{ann}_C(U)$. So, $\text{Ass}_C(M)$ and $\text{As}_C(M)$ are essentially the same object. This is not the case if the ring C is noncommutative.

Lemma 3.4 *Let R be a ring.*

1. *Let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ be R -modules of finite uniform dimension. Then*

$$\text{As}_R(M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n) = \text{As}_R(M_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{As}_R(M_n).$$

2. *Let $0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence of R -modules each of them has finite uniform dimension. Then $\text{As}_R(M) \subseteq \text{As}_R(M_1) \cup \text{As}_R(M_2)$.*

3. *Let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ be nonzero submodules of finite uniform dimension of a module M such that $\text{As}_R(M_i) \cap \text{As}_R(M_j) = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. Then $M_1 + \dots + M_n = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n$.*

Proof. 1. For each i , let $\oplus_{j \in J_i} U_{i,j} \subseteq_e M_i$ be an essential direct sum of uniform submodules $U_{i,j}$ of U_i . Then $\text{As}_R(M_i) = \{[U_{i,j}] \mid j \in J_i\}$, and $\oplus_{i,j} U_{i,j} \subseteq_e \oplus_i M_i$ implies $\text{As}_R(\oplus_{i=1}^n M_i) = \{[U_{i,j}] \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, j \in J_i\} = \cup_{i=1}^n \text{As}_R(M_i)$.

2. If U is a uniform submodule of M then either $U \cap M_1 \neq 0$ (in that case, $[U] = [U \cap M_1] \in \text{As}_R(M_1)$) or otherwise $U \cap M_1 = 0$, in that case U can be identified with a uniform submodule of M_2 , hence $[U] \in \text{As}_R(M_2)$. Therefore, $\text{As}_R(M) \subseteq \text{As}_R(M_1) \cup \text{As}_R(M_2)$.

3. Suppose that $n = 2$. Then $N := M_1 \cap M_2 = 0$ since otherwise, that is, $N \neq 0$, we would have $\text{As}_R(N) \neq \emptyset$ since $\text{u.dim}(N) \leq \text{u.dim}(M_1) < \infty$ and, by the second statement, $\text{As}_R(N) \subseteq \text{As}_R(M_1) \cap \text{As}_R(M_2) = \emptyset$, a contradiction. So, the result is true for $n = 2$.

Let $n > 2$. We use induction on n . By induction, the sum $A := M_1 + \cdots + M_{n-1}$ is a direct sum. Then, by the first statement, $\text{As}_R(A) = \cup_{i=1}^{n-1} \text{As}_R(M_i)$, and then $\text{As}_R(A) \cap \text{As}_R(M_n) = \emptyset$. Hence, $A + M_n = A \oplus M_n = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n$. $\square$

4 Primary decompositions

In this section, the notions of primary submodule and of primary decomposition of a submodule will be generalized to the case of submodules of uniformly finite modules. The main properties of primary decompositions for commutative Noetherian rings, Theorem 2.1, still hold in this situation (Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 4.5).

Uniformly finite rings and modules.

Definition. Let R be a ring, an R -module M is called **a uniformly finite R -module** if all factor modules of M have *finite* uniform dimension. Clearly, *each Noetherian module is uniformly finite*. In particular, *all finitely generated modules over an arbitrary left Noetherian ring are uniformly finite*.

Given any submodules N and L of M with $N \cap L = 0$, there is a submodule C of M that contains L and is *maximal* with respect to the property that $N \cap C = 0$ ([4], 2.2.3). This is called a **complement** to N in M that contains L . Clearly, $N \oplus C \subseteq_e M$.

Lemma 4.1 *Let R be a ring, and $M_1, \dots, M_n, M$ be R -modules.*

1. *If $0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of R -modules then M is a uniformly finite R -module iff M_1 and M_2 are uniformly finite R -modules.*
2. *$\oplus_{i=1}^n M_i$ is a uniformly finite R -module iff $M_1, \dots, M_n$ are uniformly finite R -modules.*
3. *If $M_1, \dots, M_n$ are submodules of M then $\sum_{i=1}^n M_i$ is a uniformly finite R -module iff $M_1, \dots, M_n$ are uniformly finite R -modules.*

Proof. 1. It is obvious that if M is uniformly finite then so are M_1 and M_2 .

Suppose that the modules M_1 and M_2 are uniformly finite. Then they have finite uniform dimension. Without loss of generality we can assume that $M_2 = M/M_1$. Given a submodule N of M . We have to prove that $\text{u.dim}(M/N) < \infty$. Consider the short exact sequence of R -modules

$$0 \rightarrow M_1/M_1 \cap N \rightarrow M/N \rightarrow M/(M_1 + N) \simeq (M/M_1)/(M_1 + N/M_1) \rightarrow 0.$$

The modules $M_1/M_1 \cap N$ and $M/(M_1 + N)$ are uniformly finite as factor modules of the uniformly finite modules M_1 and $M_2 = M/M_1$ respectively. So, without loss of generality we can assume that $N = 0$, and we have to prove that M has finite uniform dimension.

Choose any complement submodule to M_1 in M , say C . Then $M_1 \cap C = 0$ and $M_1 \oplus C \subseteq_e M$. The module C can be identified with its image in M_2 under the module epimorphism $M \rightarrow M_2 = M/M_1$ since $M_1 \cap C = 0$. Then $\text{u.dim}(C) \leq \text{u.dim}(M_2) < \infty$, hence $\text{u.dim}(M_1 \oplus C) = \text{u.dim}(M_1) + \text{u.dim}(C) < \infty$, and so $\text{u.dim}(M) = \text{u.dim}(M_1 \oplus C) < \infty$ since $M_1 \oplus C \subseteq_e M$, as required. This proves that M is a uniformly finite module.

2. This statement follows from the first statement.

3. If the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n M_i$ is a uniformly finite module then so are the modules $M_1, \dots, M_n$, by the first statement. If $M_1, \dots, M_n$ are uniformly finite modules then so is their direct sum, by statement 2. The sum $\sum_{i=1}^n M_i$ is a uniformly finite module as an epimorphic image of the uniformly finite module $\oplus_{i=1}^n M_i$. $\square$

By Lemma 4.1, if M is a uniformly finite module then so is *every subfactor* of it.

Definition. A ring R is called a **left uniformly finite ring** iff ${}_R R$ is a uniformly finite module iff all finitely generated R -modules are uniformly finite (by Lemma 4.1, this definition makes sense). Every *left Noetherian ring is a left uniformly finite ring*.

Corollary 4.2 1. *Each epimorphic image of a left uniformly finite ring is a left uniformly finite ring.*

2. *A direct product of rings $R_1 \times \dots \times R_n$ is a left uniformly finite ring iff $R_1, \dots, R_n$ are left uniformly finite rings.*

Proof. This is a particular case of Lemma 4.1. $\square$

The category $\text{ufMod}(R)$ of uniformly finite R -modules is the full subcategory of the category $\text{Mod}(R)$ of R -modules. The category $\text{ufMod}(R)$ contains all the simple R -modules and is closed under submodules, factor modules, extensions, and finite direct sums. The category $\text{ufMod}(R)$ contains all Noetherian R -modules.

Primary submodules.

Definition. A submodule N of a module M is **primary** if $\text{u.dim}(M/N) < \infty$ and $\text{As}(M/N) = \{X\}$ (i.e. the set $\text{As}(M/N)$ consists of a single element), we say also that N is **X -primary**.

For commutative rings, this definition coincides with the classical one modulo the identification of prime ideals with their correspondent uniform modules (Lemma 3.1). For a commutative ring, a finite intersection of P -primary submodules is a P -primary submodule. The same result is also true for noncommutative rings.

Lemma 4.3 *Suppose that $N_1, \dots, N_s$ are X -primary submodules of a module M then so is their intersection.*

Proof. Via the module monomorphism

$$M / \cap_{i=1}^s N_i \rightarrow \oplus_{i=1}^s M / N_i, \quad m + \cap_{i=1}^s N_i \mapsto (m + N_1, \dots, m + N_s),$$

the module $M / \cap_{i=1}^s N_i$ can be viewed as a submodule of the direct sum. Then,

$$\text{u.dim}(M / \cap_{i=1}^s N_i) \leq \text{u.dim}(\oplus_{i=1}^s M / N_i) = \sum_{i=1}^s \text{u.dim}(M / N_i) < \infty$$

and, by Lemma 3.4,

$$\text{As}(M/\cap_{i=1}^s N_i) \subseteq \text{As}(\oplus_{i=1}^s M/N_i) = \cup_{i=1}^s \text{As}(M/N_i) = \{X\},$$

so the intersection $\cap_{i=1}^s N_i$ is an X -primary module. $\square$

Definition. Let $N, N_1, \dots, N_s$ be submodules of M such that $N = \cap_{i=1}^s N_i$. The intersection $N = \cap_{i=1}^s N_i$ is called a **primary decomposition** of N if each N_i is X_i -primary submodule of M . The left primes $X_1, \dots, X_s$ are called the **associated left primes** of the primary decomposition $N = \cap_{i=1}^s N_i$.

In general, the set $\{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ is not an invariant of the submodule N of M (it may vary for different primary decompositions), and some of the X_i 'th may coincide. If the primary decomposition $N = \cap_{i=1}^s N_i$ is **irredundant** (i.e. no N_i can be dropped) then the set $\{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ coincides with the set $\text{As}_R(M/N)$ of associated left primes of the module M/N and the elements $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are *distinct* (Theorem 4.4), and so it is an invariant of the submodule N of M . In this case, we say that $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are the **associated left primes** of the submodule N of M , i.e. the associated left primes of the submodule N of M is the associated left primes of any *irredundant* primary decomposition of N in M .

For a finite set S , let $|S|$ be the number of elements in S .

Theorem 4.4 *Let R be a ring, M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module. Then each submodule N of M with $N \neq M$ is the intersection of primary submodules, say $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$, with $\text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{X_i\}$ (i.e. each submodule N of M such that $N \neq M$ admits a primary decomposition) and*

1. $\text{As}_R(M/N) \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^s \text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$.
2. *If the intersection is irredundant then $\text{As}_R(M/N) = \cup_{i=1}^s \text{As}_R(M/N_i)$.*
3. *If the intersection is **shortest** (i.e. there is no such intersection with fewer terms) then each associated left prime of M/N is equal to X_i for exactly one index i .*
4. *Let $N = L_1 \cap \dots \cap L_r$ be a primary decomposition of N in M . Then it is shortest iff $r = |\text{As}_R(M/N)|$.*

Proof. The fact that each submodule N of M such that $N \neq M$ admits a primary decomposition follows from Proposition 5.1.

Passing to the factor module M/N we may assume that $N = 0$. Since $0 = N = \cap_{i=1}^s N_i$, we have the R -module monomorphism

$$M \rightarrow \oplus_{i=1}^s M/N_i, \quad m \mapsto (m + N_1, \dots, m + N_s).$$

So, we can identify the module M with its image in the direct sum. By the assumption, N_i is a X_i -primary submodule of N , so there is an essential submodule $U_{i,1} \oplus \dots \oplus U_{i,n_i}$ of M/N_i where the $U_{i,j}$ are uniform modules with $[U_{i,j}] = X_i$. Then $U := \oplus_{i,j} U_{i,j}$ is the essential submodule of $\oplus_{i=1}^s M/N_i$. If V is a uniform submodule of M then $0 \neq V' := V \cap U$

is a uniform submodule of U , hence $[V] = [V'] = [U_{i,j}] = X_i$ for some i and j . Therefore, $\text{As}_R(M/N) \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^s \text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$. This proves the first statement.

Suppose that the intersection $0 = N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is irredundant, that is, $N'_i := \cap_{j \neq i} N_j \neq 0$ for each $i = 1, \dots, s$. Then $N'_i \cap N_i = 0$, and so, for each i , N'_i can be viewed as a nonzero submodule of M/N_i , and so $\text{As}_R(N'_i) = \text{As}_R(M/N_i)$. Now, $\cup_{i=1}^s \text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \cup_{i=1}^s \{[N'_i]\} \subseteq \text{As}_R(M)$. The inverse inclusion holds by the first statement. This proves the second statement.

Suppose that the intersection $0 = N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is shortest. Then the elements $X_1, \dots, X_s$ are distinct (otherwise, say $X_i = X_j$ for some $i \neq j$, and so $N' = N_i \cap N_j$ were a X_i -primary submodule of M (Lemma 4.3), $0 = N = N' \cap (\cap_{k \neq i,j} N_k)$ were the intersection of primary submodules which would contradict to the minimality of s). This proves the third statement.

The forth statement follows from the third. $\square$

Definition. A submodule $N \subset M$ is **irreducible** if N is not the intersection of two strictly larger submodules.

Corollary 4.5 *Each Noetherian module M and, in particular, every finitely generated module over a left Noetherian ring is a uniformly finite module, and so Theorem 4.4 holds.*

The fact that *every submodule N of a Noetherian module M with $N \neq M$ admits a primary decomposition* can be proved directly using the Noetherian condition in a similar fashion as in the commutative case.

Proof. Every submodule of M which is not equal to M is a finite intersection of irreducible submodules. Otherwise, since M is Noetherian, one could choose a submodule, say L , of M maximal among those submodules that do not share this property. In particular, L itself is not irreducible, so it is the intersection of two strictly larger submodules, say L_1 and L_2 . By the maximality of L , both modules L_1 and L_2 are finite intersections of irreducible submodules, and it follows that L is too. This contradiction proves the claim and shows that $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ with N_i irreducible. In order to finish the proof it suffices to show that *any irreducible submodule $L \subseteq N$ is primary* (then it will follow that $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is a primary decomposition of N in M). Since L is irreducible, we must have $\text{u.dim}(M/L) = 1$ (otherwise, $\text{u.dim}(M/L) > 1$, and we would find two uniform submodules, say $\overline{V}_1$ and $\overline{V}_2$, of M/L with $\overline{V}_1 \cap \overline{V}_2 = 0$). Let V_i be the pre-image of $\overline{V}_i$ under the epimorphism $M \rightarrow M/L, m \mapsto m + L$. Then the submodules V_1 and V_2 would strictly contain the module L and $V_1 \cap V_2 = L$, which would contradict the irreducibility of L . So, M/L is a uniform module, hence L is a $[M/L]$ -primary submodule of M . $\square$

If R is a commutative Noetherian ring we get the classical primary decomposition.

5 Description of shortest primary decompositions

In this section, maximal shortest primary decompositions are introduced. Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4 describe respectively all the shortest primary decompositions and all the maximal shortest primary decompositions of submodules of uniformly finite modules.

They explain why primary decompositions are not unique (in general, they are highly non-unique). In the commutative situation, another reason for non-uniqueness is given in [1], 3.7.

Maximal shortest primary decompositions. Let R be a ring, M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M such that $N \neq M$, $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s$ be a shortest primary decomposition of N in M . Then $\text{As}_R(M/N_1) = \{X_1\}, \dots, \text{As}_R(M/N_s) = \{X_s\}$ are distinct sets, and $\text{As}_R(M/N) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ (Proposition 5.1 and Theorem 4.4).

Definition. The shortest primary decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s$ is **maximal** (with respect to inclusion) if given another shortest primary decomposition $N = N'_1 \cap \cdots \cap N'_s$ with $\text{As}_R(M/N'_i) = \text{As}_R(M/N_i)$ and $N_i \subseteq N'_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ then $N_1 = N'_1, \dots, N_s = N'_s$.

We will soon prove that for the submodule N a shortest primary decomposition always exists (Proposition 5.1), and each shortest primary decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s$ is *contained* in a maximal shortest primary decomposition $N = N'_1 \cap \cdots \cap N'_s$ (Theorem 5.3) which means that $\text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \text{As}_R(M/N'_i)$ and $N_i \subseteq N'_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. The last statement is obvious if the module M is Noetherian.

Recall that for any submodules N and L of M with $N \cap L = 0$, there is a submodule C of M that contains L and is *maximal* with respect to the property that $N \cap C = 0$ ([4], 2.2.3). This is called a *complement* to N in M that contains L . Then $N \oplus C \subseteq_e M$. In general, the complement C is not unique (a typical example is when the ring is a field then there exist many subspaces C of M with the required properties). If $N \neq 0$ then $N \subseteq_e M/C$ via $M \rightarrow M/C, m \mapsto m + C$ (it is evident due to maximality of C).

Proposition 5.1 *Let M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M with $N \neq M$, $W_1, \dots, W_s$ be nonzero submodules of M/N such that $W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_s \subseteq_e M/N$ and the sets $\text{As}_R(W_1) = \{X_1\}, \dots, \text{As}_R(W_s) = \{X_s\}$ are distinct. For each $i = 1, \dots, s$, let $\overline{C}_i$ be a complement to W_i in M/N that contains the modules $W_j, j \neq i$; and let $C_i := \pi^{-1}(\overline{C}_i)$ where $\pi : M \rightarrow M/N, m \mapsto m + N$. Then*

1. *each W_i is an essential submodule of M/C_i , hence C_i is an X_i -primary submodule of M .*
2. *$N = C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_s$ is a maximal shortest primary decomposition of N in M .*

Remarks. 1. The assumption that $W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_s \subseteq_e M/N$ can be weakened to $W_1 + \cdots + W_s \subseteq_e M/N$ since the later together with the assumption that the elements $X_1, \dots, X_s$ are distinct imply the former (Lemma 3.4.(3)).

2. For each submodule N of a uniformly finite module M such that $N \neq M$, one can find nonzero submodules $W_1, \dots, W_s$ of M/N such that $W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_n \subseteq_e M/N$ and the sets $\text{As}_R(W_1) = \{X_1\}, \dots, \text{As}_R(W_n) = \{X_n\}$ are *distinct*. Since $n := \text{u.dim}(M/N) < \infty$, take a direct sum $U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_n \subseteq_e M/N$ of uniform submodules of M/N . If $\text{As}_R(M/N) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ then, for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, set $W_i := \oplus \{U_j \mid [U_j] = X_i\}$.

Proof. Passing to the factor module M/N , one can assume that $N = 0$. Then $\overline{C}_i = C_i$ is a complement to W_i in M , and so W_i is an essential submodule of M/C_i (via $M \rightarrow M/C_i$,

$m \mapsto m + C_i$), hence C_i is an X_i -primary submodule of M since $\text{As}_R(W_i) = \{X_i\}$. This proves the first statement.

Let us show that $C := C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_s = 0$. Suppose that $C \neq 0$, we seek a contradiction. Then $C' := C \cap (W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_s) \neq 0$ since $W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_s$ is an essential submodule of M . Choose a nonzero element, say c , of C' . Then $c = w_1 + \cdots + w_s$ with $w_i \in W_i$. There exists i such that $w_i \neq 0$. Then $0 \neq w_i = c - \sum_{j \neq i} w_j \in W_i \cap C_i = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, $C = 0$. Then the intersection $C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_s = 0$ is a primary decomposition of the zero module in M (by the first statement). Now, the proof of Theorem 4.4 is complete. The primary decomposition $C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_s = 0$ is shortest (by Theorem 4.4) since $X_1, \dots, X_s$ are distinct and $\text{As}_R(M) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$.

Suppose that the shortest primary decomposition $0 = C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_s$ is contained in a shortest primary decomposition $0 = C'_1 \cap \cdots \cap C'_s$, that is, $\text{As}_R(M/C_i) = \text{As}_R(M/C'_i)$ and $C_i \subseteq C'_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. If there exists i such that $C_i \neq C'_i$ then $C'_i \cap W_i \neq 0$, by the maximality of C_i , hence

$$0 = C'_1 \cap \cdots \cap C'_s \supseteq C'_i \cap (\cap_{j \neq i} C_j) \supseteq C'_i \cap W_i \neq 0,$$

a contradiction. Therefore, $0 = C'_1 \cap \cdots \cap C'_s$ is a maximal shortest primary decomposition of 0 in M . $\square$

So, for any submodule of uniformly finite module there exists a (maximal) shortest primary decomposition.

We will see shortly that Proposition 5.1 gives *all* the maximal shortest primary decompositions of N in M (Corollary 5.4).

Lemma 5.2 *Let $N_1, \dots, N_s$ be nonzero submodules of a nonzero module M with $N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s = 0$. The intersection $N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s = 0$ is irredundant iff $U_i := \cap_{j \neq i} N_j \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$; in this case, $U_1 + \cdots + U_s = U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_s$.*

Proof. The first statement is obvious, the second follows from the fact that, for each i , $U_i \cap \sum_{j \neq i} U_j \subseteq U_i \cap N_i = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s = 0$. $\square$

Theorem 5.3 (Description of shortest primary decompositions) *Let M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M with $N \neq M$, $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s$ be a shortest primary decomposition of N in M , $\text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{X_i\}$. Then*

1. *there exist nonzero submodules $W_1, \dots, W_s$ of M/N such that $W_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W_s \subseteq_e M/N$ and $\text{As}_R(W_i) = \{X_i\}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, and*
2. *for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, there exists a complement, say C_i , of W_i in M/N containing $\sum_{j \neq i} W_j$ such that $\sum_{j \neq i} W_j \subseteq N_i/N \subseteq C_i$.*
In this way, all the shortest primary decompositions of N in M are obtained. In more detail,
3. *given any nonzero submodules $W'_1, \dots, W'_s$ of M/N such that $W'_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus W'_s \subseteq_e M/N$ and $\text{As}_R(W'_i) = \{X_i\}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, s$ (note that $\text{As}_R(M/N) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$),*

4. for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, given a complement submodule C'_i of W'_i in M/N that contains the sum $\sum_{j \neq i} W'_j$,
5. for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, given a submodule N'_i of M containing N and such that $\text{As}_R(M/N'_i) = \{X_i\}$ and $\sum_{j \neq i} W'_j \subseteq N'_i/N \subseteq C'_i$.

Then $N = N'_1 \cap \dots \cap N'_s$ is a shortest primary decomposition of N in M .

Proof. Passing to the factor module M/N , we can assume that $N = 0$. The shortest primary decomposition $0 = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is irredundant. By Lemma 5.2, $W_i := \cap_{j \neq i} N_j \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$, and $W_1 + \dots + W_s = W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_s$. For each i , $W_i \cap N_i = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s = 0$, hence $W_i \subseteq N/N_i$, and so $\text{As}_R(W_i) = \{X_i\}$. We claim that the sum $W := W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_s$ is an *essential* submodule of M . Suppose that this is not true, then one can find a uniform submodule, say U , of M with $W \cap U = 0$ (any nonzero module of finite uniform dimension contains a uniform module). Since $\text{As}_R(M) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ and $\text{As}_R(W_1) = \{X_1\}, \dots, \text{As}_R(W_s) = \{X_s\}$, there exists i such that $[U] = X_i$. Note that, for each $j \neq i$, $U_j := N_j \cap U \neq 0$ (since $N_j \cap U = 0$ would imply $U \subseteq M/N_j$, and then $\{X_i\} = \text{As}_R(U) \subseteq \text{As}_R(M/N_j) = \{X_j\}$, this would contradict to the fact that $X_i \neq X_j$). Each U_j ($j \neq i$) is a nonzero submodule of the uniform module U , hence

$$0 \neq \cap_{j \neq i} U_j \subseteq U \cap (\cap_{j \neq i} N_j) = U \cap W_i \subseteq U \cap W = 0,$$

a contradiction. This contradiction proves that W is an essential submodule of M , and the first statement holds.

Recall that $W_i \cap N_i = 0$ for each i . Let C_i be a complement to W_i in M such that $N_i \subseteq C_i$. In particular, the module C_i contains the sum $\sum_{j \neq i} W_j$ ($\subseteq N_i$). So, the second statement holds.

It remains to show that all the shortest primary decompositions of $N = 0$ in M are obtained in this way. Let the modules $W'_1, \dots, W'_s, C'_1, \dots, C'_s, N'_1, \dots, N'_s$ be chosen as in statements 3-5. By Proposition 5.1, $\cap_{i=1}^s N'_i \subseteq \cap_{i=1}^s C'_i = 0$, and so $\cap_{i=1}^s N'_i = 0$ is a shortest primary decomposition of 0 in M since $\text{As}_R(M/N'_1) = \{X_1\}, \dots, \text{As}_R(M/N'_s) = \{X_s\}$, $\text{Ass}_R(M) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$, and $X_1, \dots, X_s$ are distinct (Theorem 4.4). $\square$

Corollary 5.4 (Description of maximal shortest primary decompositions) *Let R , M and N be as in Proposition 5.1. Then Proposition 5.1 describes all the maximal shortest primary decompositions of N in M .*

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 5.1 and Theorem 5.3. $\square$

Let R be a ring, M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M such that $N \neq M$, $\text{As}_R(M/N) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$. The following algorithm explains *how one can get a typical maximal shortest primary decomposition of N in M* .

1. Take any essential direct sum of uniform submodules in M/N , say $U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_t \subseteq_e M/N$ (note that $t = \text{u.dim}(M/N)$).

2. For each $i = 1, \dots, s$, let $W_i := \oplus \{U_j \mid [U_j] = X_i\}$. Then $W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_s \subseteq_e M/N$ and $\text{As}_R(W_1) = \{X_1\}, \dots, \text{As}_R(W_s) = \{X_s\}$.
3. For each $i = 1, \dots, s$, find a complement, say $\overline{C}_i$, to W_i in M/N that contains $\oplus_{j \neq i} W_j$, and then take its preimage $C_i := \pi^{-1}(\overline{C}_i)$ under the module epimorphism $\pi : M \rightarrow M/N, m \mapsto m + N$.
4. Then $N = C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_s$ is a maximal shortest primary decomposition of N in M , and all the maximal shortest primary decompositions are obtained in this way.

The next step gives a typical shortest primary decomposition of N in M .

5. For each $i = 1, \dots, s$, take a submodule N_i of M containing N and such that $\text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{X_i\}$ and $\oplus_{j \neq i} W_j \subseteq N_i/N \subseteq C_i$ (eg. $N_i = C_i$). Then $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is a shortest primary decomposition of N in M (and all shortest primary decompositions of N in M are obtained in this way for all possible choices of $N = C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_s$).

6 Description of shortest uniform decompositions

In this section, (maximal shortest) uniform decompositions are introduced. Theorem 6.4 and Corollary 6.6 describe respectively all the shortest uniform decompositions and all the maximal shortest uniform decompositions of submodules of uniformly finite modules. It will be proved that shortest uniform decomposition is irredundant primary decomposition (Corollary 6.2), and that each primary decomposition can be refined to a uniform decomposition (Lemma 6.7).

In this section, let R be a ring, M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M such that $N \neq M$, and $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ where $N_1, \dots, N_s$ are submodules of M .

Uniform decompositions.

Definition. A decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is called a **uniform decomposition** of N in M if each M/N_i is a uniform R -module.

Obviously, each uniform decomposition is a primary decomposition but, in general, not vice versa.

Lemma 6.1 *If $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is a uniform decomposition of N in M then $s \geq \text{u.dim}(M/N)$.*

Proof. By the assumption, each M/N_i is a uniform R -module, so $\text{u.dim}(M/N_i) = 1$. Consider the R -module monomorphism

$$M/N \rightarrow \oplus_{i=1}^s M/N_i, \quad m + N \mapsto (m + N_1, \dots, m + N_s).$$

Then $\text{u.dim}(M/N) \leq \text{u.dim}(\oplus_{i=1}^s M/N_i) = \sum_{i=1}^s \text{u.dim}(M/N_i) = s$. $\square$

Shortest uniform decompositions. A uniform decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is **shortest** if $s = \text{u.dim}(M/N)$ (the least possible value for s , by Lemma 6.1).

Corollary 6.2 *A shortest uniform decomposition is an irredundant primary decomposition.*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 6.1. $\square$

The next result proves existence of shortest uniform decompositions.

Lemma 6.3 *Let M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M such that $N \neq M$, $U_1, \dots, U_n$ be uniform submodules of M/N such that $U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n$ is an essential submodule of M/N . For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\overline{C}_i$ be a complement to U_i in M/N that contains the modules U_j , $j \neq i$; and let $C_i := \pi^{-1}(\overline{C}_i)$ where $\pi : M \rightarrow M/N$, $m \mapsto m + N$. Then*

1. *each U_i is an essential submodule of M/C_i , hence C_i is a $[U_i]$ -primary submodule of M .*
2. *$\cap_{i=1}^n C_i = N$ is a shortest uniform decomposition of N in M . In particular, $\cap_{i=1}^n C_i = N$ is an irredundant primary decomposition of N in M .*

Proof. 1. By the choice of $\overline{C}_i$, U_i is an essential submodule of $(M/N)/\overline{C}_i \simeq M/C_i$.

2. Without loss of generality one can assume that $N = 0$. Suppose that the intersection $C := C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_n$ is nonzero, then $C' := C \cap (U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n) \neq 0$ since $U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n$ is an essential submodule of M . Choose a nonzero element, say c , of C' . Then $c = u_1 + \dots + u_n$ with $u_i \in U_i$. There exists i such that $u_i \neq 0$. Then $0 \neq u_i = c - \sum_{j \neq i} u_j \in U_i \cap C_i = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, $C = 0$, and $\cap_{i=1}^n C_i = 0$ is a shortest uniform decomposition of the zero module in M (by the first statement and since $\text{u.dim}(M) = n$). By Corollary 6.2, $\cap_{i=1}^n C_i = 0$ is an irredundant primary decomposition of 0 in M . $\square$

The next theorem describes all shortest uniform decompositions for submodules of nonzero uniformly finite modules.

Theorem 6.4 (Description of shortest uniform decompositions) *Let M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M such that $N \neq M$, $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_n$ be a shortest uniform decomposition of N in M . Then*

1. *the module M/N contains a direct sum $U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n$ of uniform submodules with $\text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{[U_i]\}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, and*
2. *for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exists a complement, say C_i , of U_i in M/N containing $\sum_{j \neq i} U_j$ such that $\sum_{j \neq i} U_j \subseteq N_i/N \subseteq C_i$.*
In this way, all the shortest uniform decompositions of N in M are obtained. In more detail,
3. *given any direct sum $U'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U'_n \subseteq M/N$ of uniform submodules (note that $n = \text{u.dim}(M/N)$),*
4. *for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, given a complement submodule C'_i of U'_i in M/N that contains the sum $\sum_{j \neq i} U'_j$, and*

5. for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, given a submodule N'_i of M containing N and such that M/N'_i is a uniform module and $\sum_{j \neq i} U'_j \subseteq N'_i/N \subseteq C'_i$.

Then $N = N'_1 \cap \dots \cap N'_n$ is a shortest uniform decomposition of N in M . In particular, $N = N'_1 \cap \dots \cap N'_n$ is an irreducible primary decomposition of N in M .

Proof. Passing to the factor module M/N , we can assume that $N = 0$. The shortest uniform decomposition $0 = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$ is an irredundant primary decomposition (Corollary 6.2). By Lemma 5.2, $U_i := \cap_{j \neq i} N_j \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $U_1 + \dots + U_n = U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n \subseteq M$. Since $n = \text{u.dim}(M)$, each U_i must be a uniform submodule of M , and $U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n \subseteq_e M$.

For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $U_i \cap N_i = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s = 0$ implies $\{[U_i]\} \subseteq \text{As}_R(M/N_i)$, and so $\text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{[U_i]\}$ since the set $\text{As}_R(M/N_i)$ consists of a single element. So, the first condition holds.

Let C_i be a complement to U_i in M such that $N_i \subseteq C_i$ (recall that $U_i \cap N_i = 0$). In particular, the module C_i contains the sum $\sum_{j \neq i} U_j$ ($\subseteq N_i$). So, the second condition holds.

It remains to show that all the shortest uniform decompositions of $N = 0$ in M can be obtained in this way. Let the modules $U'_1, \dots, U'_n, C'_1, \dots, C'_n, N'_1, \dots, N'_n$ be chosen as in statements 3-5. By Proposition 6.3, $\cap_{i=1}^n N'_i \subseteq \cap_{i=1}^n C'_i = 0$, and so $\cap_{i=1}^n N'_i = 0$ is a shortest uniform decomposition of 0 in M since $n = \text{u.dim}(M)$ and all the M/N'_i are uniform (by statement 5). $\square$

Corollary 6.5 *Let M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M such that $N \neq M$, $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_n$ be a shortest uniform decomposition of N in M , $X_i := [M/N_i] \in \text{l.spec}(R)$. Up to order, let $X_1, \dots, X_s$ be all the distinct left primes among $X_1, \dots, X_n$; and for each $i = 1, \dots, s$, let n_i be the number of times the element X_i occurs in the series $X_1, \dots, X_n$. Then $\text{As}_R(M/N) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ and $n_i = \text{mult}_{M/N}(X_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.*

Proof. We may assume that statements 1 and 2 of Theorem 6.4 hold. Since $n = \text{u.dim}(M/N)$ the submodule $U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n$ of M/N must be essential, and so $\text{As}_R(M/N) = \{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ and $n_i = \text{mult}_{M/N}(X_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. $\square$

Maximal shortest uniform decompositions. A shortest uniform decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_n$ of N in M is **maximal** (with respect to inclusion) if given another shortest uniform decomposition $N = N'_1 \cap \dots \cap N'_n$ of N in M with $N_i \subseteq N'_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $N_1 = N'_1, \dots, N_n = N'_n$.

Lemma 6.3 and Theorem 6.4 show that each shortest uniform decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_n$ of N in M is contained in a maximal shortest uniform decomposition, say $N = N'_1 \cap \dots \cap N'_n$, which means that $N_i \subseteq N'_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. In this case, by Theorem 6.4, $\text{As}_R(M/N_i) = \{[\cap_{j \neq i} N_j]\} = \{[\cap_{j \neq i} N'_j]\} = \text{As}_R(M/N'_i)$ as $\cap_{j \neq i} N_j \subseteq \cap_{j \neq i} N'_j$ is the inclusion of uniform modules.

Corollary 6.6 (Description of maximal shortest uniform decompositions) *Let M and N be as in Lemma 6.3. Then Lemma 6.3 describes all the maximal shortest uniform decompositions of N in M .*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 6.3 and Theorem 6.4. $\square$

Recall that M be a nonzero uniformly finite R -module, N be a submodule of M such that $N \neq M$. The following algorithm explains *how one can get a typical maximal shortest uniform decomposition of N in M .*

1. Take any essential direct sum of uniform submodules in M/N , say $U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_n \subseteq_e M/N$ (note that $n = \text{u.dim}(M/N)$).
2. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, find a complement, say $\overline{C}_i$, to U_i in M/N that contains $\bigoplus_{j \neq i} U_j$, and then take its preimage $C_i := \pi^{-1}(\overline{C}_i)$ under the module epimorphism $\pi : M \rightarrow M/N, m \mapsto m + N$.
3. Then $N = C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_n$ is a maximal shortest uniform decomposition of N in M , and all the maximal shortest uniform decomposition are obtained in this way.

The next step *gives a typical shortest uniform decomposition of N in M .*

4. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, take a submodule N_i of M containing N and such that $\bigoplus_{j \neq i} U_j \subseteq N_i/N \subseteq \overline{C}_i$ and M/N_i is uniform (eg. $N_i = C_i$). Then $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s$ is a shortest uniform decomposition of N in M (and all shortest uniform decompositions of N in M are obtained in this way for all possible choices of $N = C_1 \cap \cdots \cap C_n$).

A primary decomposition $N = \bigcap_{i=1}^t N_i$ of N in M is called a **refinement** of a primary decomposition $N = \bigcap_{j=1}^s M_j$ of N in M if the set $\{1, \dots, t\}$ is a disjoint union of its non-empty subsets $I_1, \dots, I_s$ such that, for each $j = 1, \dots, s$, $M_j = \bigcap_{k \in I_j} N_k$ and $\text{As}_R(M/N_k) = \text{As}_R(M/M_j)$ for all $k \in I_j$.

Lemma 6.7 *For any primary decomposition of a submodule of a uniformly finite module there exists a refinement which is a uniform decomposition.*

Proof. Let $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_s$ be a primary decomposition of a submodule N of a uniformly finite module M such that $N \neq M$. For each $i = 1, \dots, s$, let $N_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n_i} N_{i,j}$, $n_i = \text{u.dim}(M/N_i)$, be a shortest uniform decomposition of N_i in M . Then $N = \bigcap_{i,j} N_{i,j}$ is a refinement of the primary decomposition $N = \bigcap_{i=1}^s N_i$, and the refinement is a uniform decomposition. $\square$

References

- [1] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra. With a view toward algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 150. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

- [2] O. Goldman, Rings and modules of quotients. *J. Algebra* **13** (1969) 10–47.
- [3] L. Lesieur and R. Croisot, *Algèbre noethérienne non commutative*, Cauthier-Villars, 1963.
- [4] J. C. McConnell and J. C. Robson, *Noncommutative Noetherian rings*. With the co-operation of L. W. Small. Revised edition. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 30. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [5] G. Michler, Goldman’s primary decomposition and the tertiary decomposition. *J. Algebra* **16** (1970) 129–137.

Department of Pure Mathematics
 University of Sheffield
 Hicks Building
 Sheffield S3 7RH
 UK
 email: v.bavula@sheffield.ac.uk